



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/919,538	07/31/2001	James Joseph Babka	021556.0124	4376
22850	7590	03/03/2006	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			OPIE, GEORGE L	
1940 DUKE STREET			ART UNIT	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			PAPER NUMBER	
			2194	
DATE MAILED: 03/03/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/919,538

Applicant(s)

BABKA ET AL.

Examiner

George L. Opie

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2126

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Request for Continued Examination (RCE), filed 03 November 2005, is acceptable and has renewed the consideration of the instant Application. Claims 1-19 are pending.

This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment filed 21 September 2005, in which claims 1-11 and 14-17 were amended.

2. Descriptive Title Required

The title of the invention is not descriptive. The title should be as **"specific as possible"** 37 CFR 1.72 while not exceeding "500 characters in length". Patent titles should provide "informative value" and serve to aid in the "indexing, classifying, searching" and other official functions. A new title is required that is **clearly indicative of the invention** to which the claims are directed. MPEP606.01 (emphasis added).

3. Request for copy of Applicant's response on floppy disk:

Please help expedite the prosecution of this application by including, along with your amendment response in paper form, an electronic file copy in WordPerfect, Microsoft Word, or in ASCII text format on a 3½ inch IBM format floppy disk. Please include all pending claims along with your responsive remarks. Only the paper copy will be entered -- your floppy disk file will be considered a duplicate copy. Signatures are not required on the disk copy. The floppy disk copy is not mandatory; however, it will help expedite the processing of your application. Your cooperation is appreciated.

4. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-6, 8, 10-11, 14-15, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Grooters (U.S. Patent 6,389,487) in view of McDougall et al. (U.S. Patent 5,999,966).

Art Unit: 2126

As to claim 1, Grooters teaches a video network platform for managing a plurality of video network devices (fig.3 and the associated text) for facilitating video conference calls, the video network platform comprising:

a network interface module operable to interface with the plurality of video network devices and to represent at least one of the plurality of video network devices as an interface object (see fig.3 and col.4, line 56-67);

one or more management applications operable to manage a video network device represented as an application object (col.2, lines 4-10 and col.5, lines 24-30); and

an adapter engine associated with the network interface module (col. 3, lines 34-59 and figs. 3-4).

Grooters does not explicitly disclose the creation of an application object for a network video device, the application object corresponding to the interface object for the device, however, Grooters describes "an adapter operatively coupled to the video device for providing access to the video device to one or more applications executable by the information handling system" (col.1, lines 53-59), and in view of these teachings, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have included "the adapter engine operable to create an application object for a device, the application object corresponding to the interface object for the device" because this would allow multiple applications to simultaneously share and control a single video device.

McDougall teaches the video conference modules for interconnecting network video conference devices, col. 7 lines 21 t-67. It would have been obvious to combine McDougall's teachings with Grooters because the object-oriented paradigm would facilitate management efficacy of the video network components.

As to claim 2, Grooters teaches an override interface object associated with the network interface, the override object operable to accept a request for an interface object and to direct the request to an application object corresponding to the interface object (fig.6 and the associated text).

As to claim 3, Grooters teaches a discovery engine associated with the network interface, the discovery engine operable to detect each of the plurality of video network devices and initiate creation of an object to represent each detected video network device (col.6, lines 8-18).

As to claim 4, Grooters teaches the discovery engine initiates creation of an application object by the adapter engine, the adapter engine further operable to initiate creation of a corresponding interface object by the network interface (col.1 lines 51-59).

Art Unit: 2126

As to claim 5, Grooters teaches the adapter engine incorporates attributes of the interface object into the corresponding application object (fig.4 and associated text).

As to claim 6, Grooters teaches the interface object comprises a managed object (col.5 lines 32-51).

As to claim 8, Grooters teaches a scheduling application (fig.7 and associated text).

As to claim 10, Grooters teaches a monitoring application (col.5, lines 32-50).

As to claim 11, the rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Grooters further teaches detecting a video network device interfaced with the video network (col.6, lines 8-33); forwarding the interface information to the application object (fig.7 and associated text); and populating the application object with video network device information (col.1, lines 50-59 and col.7, lines 13-30).

As to claim 14, Grooters teaches interfacing a management application with a video network device through the application object corresponding with the device (col.6, lines 8-33).

As to claims 15 and 17, note the rejections of claims 8 and 10 above.

As to claim 18, Grooters teaches applying dynamic attribute query capabilities to populate a corresponding interface object (col.7, lines 13-30).

As to claim 19, note the discussion of claim 1 above for "creating an interface object that corresponds to the application object."

6. Claims 7, 9, 12, 13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grooters and McDougall as applied to claims 1 and 11, respectively, and further in view of Golden et al. (U.S. Patent 6,272,127).

As to claim 7, the combination of Grooters and McDougall does not explicitly teach a Management Bean.

Golden teaches a Management Bean (col.7, lines 30-34).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Golden and Grooters as modified because Golden's teaching would have provided the capability for adding a number of Java features, such as reuseable, platform-independent components to Grooters's system, thereby making the combined system of Grooters's and McDougall well suited for the World Wide Web environment

Art Unit: 2126

As to claim 9, the combination of Grooters and McDougall does not explicitly teach a diagnostics application. Golden teaches a diagnostics application (col.16, lines 5-16). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Golden and Grooters as modified because Golden's teaching would have provided the capability for diagnosing problems of the video devices. Therefore, facilitating the controlling of the video devices in the system.

As to claim 12, note the discussion of claim 7 above for rejection.

As to claim 13, the combination of Grooters and McDougall does not explicitly teach a Web NMS Managed Object. Golden teaches a Web NMS Managed Object (col.40, lines 3-13). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Golden and Grooters as modified because Golden's teaching would have provided the capability for managing the video devices in the Web environment.

As to claim 16, note the discussion of claim 9 above for rejection.

7. The prior art of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure. Specifically, the below reference(s) will also have relevancy to one or more elements of the Applicant's claimed invention as follows:

U.S. Patent No. 6,909,708 to Krishnaswamy et al. which teaches the object-oriented video conferencing architecture.

8. Response to Applicant's Arguments:

Applicant's remarks accompanying the Amendment filed 21 September 2005, are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection which were necessitated by the amendments to claim 1 and 11.

Contact Information:

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.

Art Unit: 2126

Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private-PAIR or Public-PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private-PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

Should you have questions regarding access to the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

All responses sent by U.S. Mail should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand carried responses should be delivered to the *Customer Service Window* (Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314) and, if submitting an electronic copy on floppy or CD, to expedite its processing, please notify the below identified examiner prior to delivery, so that the Applicant can "handoff" the electronic copy directly to the examiner.

The fax number (571) 273-8300 should be used for all facsimile submissions to the Office.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist at **(571) 272-2100**.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Opie at (571) 272-3766 or via e-mail at George.Opie@uspto.gov. Internet e-mail should not be used where sensitive data will be exchanged or where there exists a possibility that sensitive data could be identified unless there is an express waiver of the confidentiality requirements under 35 U.S.C. 122 by the Applicant. Sensitive data includes confidential information related to patent applications.



WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER